

bution as could well be drawn up. It is credited to the Ohio State Journal of September 30, and reads as follows:

Two years ago the finance committee of the Ohio republican state executive committee prepared and mailed a circular letter, calling attention to the importance of the state campaign that year and stating that voluntary contributions for the legitimate expenses of the state committee would be very gladly received. These letters were mailed to the leading republicans throughout the country. Because some of the letters were delivered to federal officers within the government buildings where they were employed, overzealous friends of the civil service law contended that the law had been thereby violated and brought the matter to the attention of the federal grand jury. The law on this subject forbids soliciting campaign contributions from any officer or employee of the United States in any room or building occupied by him in the discharge of his official duties, but the grand jury very sensibly concluded that it was no violation of this law to address a letter to a postmaster, or to any federal officer in a government building merely for the purpose of informing him he might contribute to the campaign fund if he so desired. Not only was this letter so carefully worded as to clearly come within the letter and spirit of the law, but extracts from the law and regulations, including everything contained therein bearing on the subject, were also enclosed in every letter so mailed.

A reporter of the State Journal interviewed Mr. W. F. Burdell, who is still treasurer of the finance committee, at his office in the Board of Trade building, this city, and asked him if his committee proposed to send out a similar circular letter this year.

Mr. Burdell replied that he had noticed a good deal of discussion outside of the committee as to what the committee would do in the matter, but the finance committee felt it ought to decide the question for itself. "While the circular letter sent out two years ago," said Mr. Burdell, "was clearly not a violation of the law, and that fact was made plain by the extracts from the law which accompanied the letter, yet the committee was subjected to a great deal of criticism on account of such action and considerable annoyance resulted. While the campaign this year is just as important as was the one of two years ago, and democratic victory this year would be just as disastrous to the country and just as great a menace to our present prosperity, and the expense of running the campaign this year will be just as large as was the expense two years ago, it has been decided not to send out such a circular this year. We believe that republicans throughout the country realize the importance of this year's campaign in Ohio. A democratic victory here would be in the light of a rebuke to the national and state administrations, and would seem to foreshadow the election of a democratic house of representatives next year. It would mean that this state would be redistricted and the number of democratic congressmen from Ohio largely increased. Realizing the importance of this year's campaign, we feel sure that republicans all over the country will gladly render their assistance without waiting for the formality of a letter from our committee. It is only necessary they should know that we will be glad of their help."

## General Miles on the Canteen.

In his annual report, recently made, General Miles reviews the canteen question. He points out that the canteen developed from the amusement room, where enlisted men were provided with books, papers and games. There they could also purchase refreshments other than intoxicating liquors. Finally light wines and beer were added to the canteen.

Referring to the act of congress which prohibited the sale of intoxicating liquors in the canteen, General Miles says: "No injury has resulted thereby, and the law has in the main been beneficial."

General Miles points out an important fact when he says that the army is composed "principally of young men who have not formed the habit of using liquors, and although the majority of the enlistments actually come in large cities, as recruiting offices are principally located there,

a large percentage of men come from homes in the country and small towns and villages in every part of the United States."

When the anti-canteen bill was before congress, its opponents urged that its passage would prevent enlistments and increase desertions. General Miles declares that this prediction has not been fulfilled. On this point the general says:

"Since the law was approved February 2, 1901, the recruiting stations have been thronged with men seeking enlistment for the service, 25,944 men having enlisted since that date, and the percentage of desertions is now far less than in former years. Desertions most usually occur during the first six months of enlistment, and a much larger percentage of enlistments has been made during the last six months than heretofore. In many cases the men that have deserted belong to a class whose presence in the service was not desirable under any conditions, and whose real character was not known at the time of enlistment."

It is further pointed out by General Miles that the anti-canteen rule has been enforced at West Point and at the National soldiers' home for many years, and has produced gratifying results. And he adds, "There is no doubt the result of the present law in its effect upon military garrisons will also be beneficial."

General Miles supports his assertion that the anti-canteen law has not caused desertions by statistics showing the strength of the army from 1867 to the present time, with the percentage of desertions and a comparison between the number of desertions during the months of April, May and June for the last three years. These show:

The percentage of desertions in 1867 was 26.7, and in 1871 30.2, the highest in recent years. From 1871 the desertions decreased to 7.8 per cent in 1875 and then increased to 9 per cent in 1880, 16.4 per cent in 1882, a gradual decrease following that year until 1897, when the percentage of desertions was 2.9. From 1898 to 1900, inclusive, the desertions averaged between 4 and 5 per cent. During the first six months of the present year the desertions amounted to only 1.9 per cent.

## The Timidity of Capital.

The supreme court of Illinois has sustained the decision of Judge Thompson, referred to in The Commoner some months ago, ordering the state board of equalization to assess about two hundred and thirty-five millions of dollars' worth of property, belonging to twenty-three corporations of Chicago, which had been escaping taxation. And now the corporations are threatening to leave the state. This is an old dodge and ought not to deceive any one. Whenever an attempt is made to compel corporations to deal justly with the public, we hear a great deal about the timidity of capital. Those who are under the influence of organized wealth always express fear that capital will pick itself up and go somewhere else. That is the answer made whenever a reduction of the legal rate of interest is suggested; the money lenders and their advocates always insist that a reduction of the rate of interest will prevent new capital from coming into the state and will drive old capital out of the state. Whenever an attempt is made to tax notes and mortgages the same argument is presented; whenever it is suggested that railroads and other corporations should pay their fair share of the taxes the timidity of capital is at once offered as a reason why they should be allowed to shirk the burdens of government at the expense of the ordinary citizen. It is about time that the plain, every-day people should show some timidity on the subject of taxation. Their rights will not be respected until they become as timid and as pugnacious as capital—for, strange to say, capital seems most pugnacious when it is charged with being most timid. The producers of wealth on the farm and in the factory have patiently borne a tax upon consumption levied for the benefit of protected manufacturers,—a tax which makes the poor man pay more than his

share and the rich man less than his share. These same wealth-producers have seen the beneficiaries of a high tariff strenuously opposing an income tax, which was intended to equalize to a small extent the burdens of federal taxation; now these same taxpayers find that the great corporations that demand special privileges and advantages from legislators, local and general, make all sorts of threats when they are called upon to list their property for assessment. It is high time for the people with small homes and small incomes to register their protest against inequality in taxation and demand justice at the hands of federal, state and local governments.

## Would it Honor McKinley?

The papers are discussing the suggestion recently made that the name of the Philippine islands be changed to the McKinley islands in honor of the late president and most of them strongly oppose the proposition. The Pittsburg Post expresses itself as follows:

"The admirers of William McKinley would do well to go a little slow in the next congress on the proposition to change the name of the Philippine islands, the historic title that has lasted over three hundred years, to that of the McKinley islands. It is also proposed to call Luzon Dewey Island, and name others after the generals who have taken part in the war, so we will have an Otis Island, a Lawton Island, and possibly an Alger Island and a Corbin Island.

But as to the McKinley proposition, would it not be well to wait a little while, if the desire is to honor the president for all time? The proposed change, the New York Tribune says, "would link President McKinley's name with the government of the country for all time, and also would be a constant and conspicuous reminder to future generations throughout the world that it was in his administration that the republic expanded its beneficent influence to the orient and there established in enduring form its institutions and systems."

But is there much likelihood that American "institutions and systems" will be established in the Philippines for all time, with their "beneficent influence?" We can hardly say the Philippine problem has reached the experimental stage in the way of civil government. There is a shadowy framework of civil government, but it is a very thin bit of veneering over a solid and substantial exercise of autocratic and military power. It is true that the organized resistance and government of Aguinaldo has passed away, but there are others who propose to take up his role, and of this we have had an illustration within a week by the slaughter of a company of American veterans on one of the more southern islands than Luzon, which has a large population and the area of the state of Ohio. Our generals in command say it is absurd to think of having a less force than 40,000 American soldiers, with corresponding naval power, to maintain our hold permanently on the Philippines, and the prediction is made, based on a knowledge of the peculiar qualities of the Malays, that we are in for a guerrilla war that may last for generations. The Dutch have one of the kind against the same type of people that has lasted for over fifty years and requires the services of 50,000 soldiers.

It may not be wise to attach Mr. McKinley's name to a group of far-distant islands the acquisition of which may prove to be the most pronounced and costly blunder, in human life and American money, in the history of the country. Would it not be better they should retain for the present their historic name, borrowed from Philip II. of Spain, whose characteristics differed widely from those of President McKinley? At least had we not better wait until the wisdom of Philippine expansion has vindicated itself as it has in the acquisitions made by Jefferson, Monroe, Polk, Pierce and Andrew Johnson, which added two-thirds to the extent of the American union compared with what it was when our independence was acknowledged by Great Britain. The New York Tribune pleads that calling the Philippine islands the McKinley islands "would perpetuate the name and glory of the martyred president and administration" is only a bit of sentimental gush. William McKinley should be remembered for something else than Philippine conquest and subjugation. How would it sound, within the domain of common sense, to call the Transvaal Robertsland or the Orange Free State Kitchenerland?"